



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/964,735	09/28/2001	Shuya Ogi	N36-135856M/TH	2177

30743 7590 09/11/2003

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.  
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD  
SUITE 340  
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

STULTZ, JESSICA T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2873

DATE MAILED: 09/11/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/964,735

Applicant(s)

OGI ET AL.

Examiner

Jessica T Stultz

Art Unit

2873

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment D, filed July 7, 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 07 July 2003 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 26, 29-30, and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takami et al.

Regarding claim 26, Takami et al discloses a rod lens array in which constituent rod lenses are such that representative values for the center-line-average roughness on their peripheral surfaces are between 0.01  $\mu\text{m}$  and 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  as averaged for the whole lens array (Column 5, lines 56-62, wherein the center line average roughness of the coating is defined as being 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  or less, Figures 5 and 9).

Regarding claims 29, it would have been inherent from Takami et al that the rod lens array disclosed above would further include the representative values for the center-line average roughness are each a value on a straight line that extends on the peripheral surface of the lens parallel to its axis, this being reasonably based upon the similarity in structure between the drawings of the reference and the claimed invention (Figures 5 and 9).

Regarding claim 30, it would have been inherent from Takami et al that the rod lens array disclosed above would further include the representative values for the center-line average roughness are each the average of values on different straight lines that extend on the peripheral surface of the lens along its axis, this being reasonably based upon the similarity in structure

Art Unit: 2873

between the drawings of the reference and the claimed invention and since values can be taken along different straight lines across the rod and then averaged to obtain an accurate representation of the entire rod (Figures 5 and 9).

Regarding claim 34, Takami et al further discloses a rod lens array wherein a resin portion that is integral with the constituent rod lenses such that it fills the gap between adjacent rod lenses and surrounds all rod lenses (Column 9, lines 48-53, Figures 5 and 9).

Regarding claim 35, Takami et al further discloses a rod lens array wherein a frame is fixed to at least one of two other surfaces of the resin portion that are on opposite surfaces of the array, along the length of the rod lenses (Column 3, lines 33-40 and Column 5, lines 44-45, wherein it is disclosed that there is some sort of holding plates in the lens array unit which holds the rods in place in the claimed arrangement, as shown in Figures 5 and 9).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25, 27, and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takami et al.

Regarding claims 25, 31, and 32, Takami et al discloses a rod lens array including at least one rod lens having a maximum roughness of 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$  to 5.0  $\mu\text{m}$  on the peripheral surface (Column 9, lines 32-37, wherein the maximum roughness of each rod is disclosed as ranging from 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$  to 5.0  $\mu\text{m}$ , Figures 5 and 9), but does not specifically disclose that the center-line

Art Unit: 2873

average roughness of at least one rod lens, or each rod lens, fall within the claimed range of 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$  to 2.0  $\mu\text{m}$ . However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the average roughness of the rod lenses of Takami et al fall within the claimed range since Takami discloses a maximum roughness ranging between 0.5  $\mu\text{m}$  to 5.0  $\mu\text{m}$ , which overlaps the applicant's claimed range and goes slightly over this range.

However, since these values are for the maximum roughness, it is obvious that the average would be less than the maximum, thereby overlapping or falling within the claimed range.

Regarding claims 27, it would have been obvious from Takami et al that a rod lens array have constituent rod lenses wherein representative values for the center-line-average roughness on the peripheral surfaces of the lenses are between 0.01  $\mu\text{m}$  and 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  as expressed by standard deviation for the whole lens array since Takami et al discloses the center line average roughness of the coating over the rod lenses be 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  or less (Column 5, lines 56-62, wherein the center line average roughness of the coating is defined as being 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  or less, Figures 5 and 9) and since is well known in the art of statistical data collection that the calculation of the value of the standard deviation is an analogous way to determine the average value of a data set.

Regarding claims 33, it would have been obvious from Takami et al that a rod lens array as disclosed above in claims 26 and 31 further have constituent rod lenses wherein representative values for the center-line-average roughness on the peripheral surfaces of the lenses are between 0.01  $\mu\text{m}$  and 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  as expressed by standard deviation for the whole lens array (Column 5, lines 56-62, wherein the center line average roughness of the coating is defined as being 0.2  $\mu\text{m}$  or less, Figures 5 and 9) since is well known in the art of statistical data collection that the

Art Unit: 2873

calculation of the value of the standard deviation is an analogous way to determine the average value of a data set.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takami et al in view of Mc Daniel et al.

Regarding claim 28, Takami et al discloses a rod lens array as disclosed above, but does not specifically disclose that the values of the diameter of the representative rod lenses fall between 0.01  $\mu\text{m}$  to 2.5  $\mu\text{m}$  as expressed by standard deviation for the whole lens array. McDaniel et al teaches of a rod lens wherein the diameter is approximately 0.250  $\mu\text{m}$  (Column 10, line 63-Column 11, line 21, Figure 6), which falls within the range specified above, in order to produce a low mass, low size rod lens (Column 10, lines 63-67, Figure 6) and it would have been obvious from that the diameter values be determined by the standard deviation since it is well known in the art of statistical data collection that the calculation of the value of the standard deviation is an analogous way to determine the average value of a data set. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for the values of the diameters of the rod lenses used in the rod lens array of Takami et al to range between 0.01  $\mu\text{m}$  to 2.5  $\mu\text{m}$  wherein the diameter values are determined by the standard deviation for the whole lens array since McDaniel et al teaches of a rod lens wherein the diameter is approximately 0.250  $\mu\text{m}$ , which falls within the range specified above, in order to produce a low mass, low size lens and since it is well known in the art of statistical calculations to determine the average value of a data set by using the measure of standard deviation.

***Response to Arguments***

Art Unit: 2873

Applicant's arguments filed July 7, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically regarding claims 25-35; applicant argues that the Takami et al reference does not disclose the specified conditions on the "peripheral surface" of the rod lenses. There is support from the specification for this argument, however, the definition of "peripheral" is not specifically defined or claimed as being the circumferential peripheral surface, rather than the "endfaces". The term peripheral can be interpreted broadly as any exterior surface of the rod lens, including the endfaces. Regarding the 103 rejection of claim 28, the applicant argues that McDaniel et al does not teach about the distribution or standard deviation of the diameters of the rod lenses. However, it is well known in the art of statistical data collection for the standard deviation of the values to be small when the rod lenses are similar in structure as disclosed in Takami et al, Figures 5 and 9. Therefore, the 102 rejections of claim 26, 29-30, and 34-35 remain as well as the 103 rejections of claims 25, 27-28 and 31-33.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Murano et al is being cited since it reads on or makes obvious the claims however was not used in the above rejections.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2873

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jessica T Stultz whose telephone number is (703) 305-6106. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:30-5, and alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Georgia Epps can be reached on 703-308-4883. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.



Jessica Stultz



JORDAN SCHWARTZ  
PRIMARY EXAMINER